UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/611,455	06/30/2003	James Harold Gray	36968/332546	1612
32210 JOHN S. PRAT	7590 06/26/200 CT	EXAMINER		
	STOCKTON LLP 369	INGVOLDSTAD, BENNETT		
1100 PEACHT SUITE 2800	KEE SIKEEI	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
ATLANTA, GA	A 30309	2623		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/26/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/611,455	GRAY ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

		BENNETT INGVOEDOTAB	2020
The MAILING DATE of t	his communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the d	correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED <u>17 June 2008</u> FA	AILS TO PLACE THIS APP	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR A	LLOWANCE.
application, applicant must time application in condition for allow	ely file one of the following vance; (2) a Notice of Appe	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi	Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this t, or other evidence, which places the with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request within one of the following time
a) The period for reply expires _		-	
no event, however, will the sta Examiner Note: If box 1 is che	tutory period for reply expire la cked, check either box (a) or (ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	in the final rejection, whichever is later. In g date of the final rejection. FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO
under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from:	r 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of f determining the period of ext (1) the expiration date of the soly received by the Office later	, on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply origi	36(a) and the appropriate extension fee of the fee. The appropriate extension fee inally set in the final Office action; or (2) as the of the final rejection, even if timely filed,
	on A brief in comp	liance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be	filed within two months of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 (CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter		avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a
 The proposed amendment(s): (a) ☐ They raise new issues th (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new issue of new	at would require further cor	nsideration and/or search (see NO	
(c) They are not deemed to appeal; and/or	place the application in bet	•	ducing or simplifying the issues for
	CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally reje	scied claims.
		21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcom			,
 Newly proposed or amended of non-allowable claim(s). 	claim(s) would be all	owable if submitted in a separate,	timely filed amendment canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the propose how the new or amended claim. The status of the claim(s) is (or Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration.	s would be rejected is prov will be) as follows:		l be entered and an explanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence because applicant failed to pro- was not earlier presented. See 	vide a showing of good and		otice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered it or other evidence is necessary and
	r other evidence failed to o		al and/or appellant fails to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION		n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attached.
The request for reconsideration See Continuation Sheet.		t does NOT place the application ir	condition for allowance because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information 13. ☐ Other:	Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)	
/Scott Beliveau/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, A	rt Unit 2623		

Continuation Sheet (PTO-303)

Application No.

Continuation Sheet

In traversing the rejections, Applicant asks with respect to the rejection of claim 1: "how did the hot key signal get from the set-top box (that performed the email query) to the interactive television service provider?" In reading claim 1, there is no indication that a hot key signal is transmitted from a user's STB to a service provider. Nor is the claim being construed in such a way for the rejection. The claim requires that the hot key signal is "transmitted to the user from an interactive television service provider via a network". This limitation is disclosed by Nakano as cited: "the application may also notify the Set Top Box user via an icon on the TV screen" [para 0016]. The application may be resident on a service provider server [para 0019]. Therefore the hot key signal is transmitted from a service provider server to a user STB, and Nakano meets the limitation as cited.

Applicant further asks: "Also, why would the set-top box send information on the availability of email, back to the interactive television service provider, so that the interactive television service provider could send this back to the set-top box along with the content signal in parts (3) and (4)?" Again, there is no indication, either in the claim or in the rejection, that a hot key signal is being sent from the set top box to the service provider.

Therefore the examiner upholds the previous rejections.